

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 5, 2004, has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 2, 5-15 and 23 have been amended and claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the specification and figures as originally filed. Entry of the amendments to the claims therefore is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections in the present application is further respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Telephonic Interview on November 3, 2004

At the outset, the undersigned notes with appreciation the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephonic interview on November 3, 2004. During the interview, the Applicants' representative proposed amending claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments appeared to overcome the present rejections and indicated that another search may be necessary.

Allowability of Claims 7, 8, 11, 13-17, 19, 20 and 22-24

The Applicants note with appreciation the indication at page 6 of the Office Action that claims 13-17, 19, 20, and 22-24 are allowable and that claims 7, 8 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. However, the Applicants have opted to defer amending claims 7, 8 and 11 in view of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks provided herein.

Rejection of Claims 1-6, 9 and 10

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bandai (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,145). At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bandai. Claim 1, from which claims 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 depend, has been amended, thereby obviating these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the limitations originally presented by claims 3 and 4 (now canceled). Accordingly, claim 1 presently recites, in part, the limitations of providing a distributed clock signal to a clock distribution network having a plurality of endpoints connected to a respective plurality of components, the plurality of endpoints including a first endpoint that drives an input to a delay locked loop and a second endpoint that drives a component that is not part of the clock distribution network, where the first endpoint is at a same propagation level as the second endpoint and modifying, using the delay locked loop, the distributed clock signal until a portion of the distributed clock signal received at the first endpoint of the plurality of endpoints is substantially synchronized to the first clock signal.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 by asserting that Bandai “taught wherein the first endpoint is at the same propagation level as a second endpoint (embodiments using endpoints memory block 45 are at the same propagation level of the endpoints in 43) of the clock distribution network (the endpoints all receive the clock following the DLL . . .” and cites Figures 1, 5, 6 and col. 5, line 48- col. 6, line 55 of Bandai. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the feedback (e.g., clock output end portions 9) provided to the DLL’s in any of Figures 1, 5, and 6 is not at a same propagation level as the endpoints that drive components (e.g., clock input end portions 6) as the figures of Bandai illustrate that the clock input end portions 6 are significantly closer to the DLLs 5 than the clock output end portions 9, and thus the clock input end portions 6 would have a lower propagation delay than the clock output end portions 9 as a result of the shorter traces between the DLLs 5 and the clock input end portions 6. In contrast, claim 1 recites the limitations that the endpoint that drives a component and the endpoint that provides feedback to the DLL are at the same propagation level (i.e., having substantially similar propagation delays). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Bandai does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of presently recited by claim 1. Consequently, Bandai fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claims 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional limitations neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-6, 9 and 10 are improper at this time and withdrawal of these rejections therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion:

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

5 November 2004
Date



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
On Behalf Of
J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)